REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

Applicant thanks the Examiner for his careful review of this application. Claims 1-3, 7-10, 14-17, and 21 have been rejected. Claims 4-6, 11-13, and 18-20 have been canceled. Claims 1, 3, 7, 8, 10, 14, 15, 17, and 21 have been amended. Claims 22-24 have been added. The claims are fully supported by the specification. No new matter is presented by these claims. Claims 22-24 have been added to more clearly and accurately claim the subject matter which Applicant regards as his invention. Additionally, Applicant has carefully reviewed the prior art of record and believes that the newly added claims are patentable in view of the prior art. Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the application in view of the above amendment and the following remarks submitted in support thereof.

Anticipation Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

The Examiner has rejected claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, and 17 under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Egevang et al., *The IP Network Address Translator (NAT)* (May 1994). For the reasons set forth below, Applicant respectfully asserts that Egevang et al. fail to identically disclose each and every feature specified in amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

Although the Applicant believes that the original pending claims are defined over the prior art of record, the Applicant has amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 to clarify that the previously defined active computing environment is a compute capsule. As amended, independent claims 1, 8, and 15 define assigning a virtual token to a resource within a compute capsule. The resource is of an underlying machine and is capable of being named by the compute capsule. A name translator is interposed between the resource and the compute capsule. Thereafter, the resource is bound to the virtual token. If the compute

capsule names the resource, then the name translator translates the virtual token into the resource.

In support of the 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections, the Examiner notes that <u>Egevang et al.</u> disclose a method and computer readable program code for providing a virtual namespace, as defined in independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Applicant respectfully traverses the Examiner's characterization as <u>Egevang et al.</u> do not teach the method and computer readable program code for providing the virtual namespace as defined in amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15. In particular, <u>Egevang et al.</u> do not teach the compute capsule defined in amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15. Furthermore, as illustrated in Figures 1 and 2 of <u>Egevang et al.</u>, <u>Egevang et al.</u> disclose that a Network Address Translator (NAT) located within the sub-routers is located between the hosts and the regional router. As such, the NAT translates IP address between the hosts and the regional router. In contrast, amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 define interposing a name translator between the <u>resource</u> and the <u>compute capsule</u>, and define the name translator translating the virtual token into the resource. Since the regional router is not a compute capsule, the name translator defined in amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 and the NAT disclosed in <u>Egevang et al.</u> serve different translating functions. Accordingly, <u>Egevang et al.</u> cannot be considered to teach the compute capsule and interposing the name translator between the resource and the compute capsule, as defined in amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15.

As <u>Egevang et al.</u> fail to teach each and every element of the claimed invention, the Applicant respectfully submits that amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over <u>Egevang et al.</u> Further, dependent claims 3, 10, and 17, each of which directly or indirectly depends from amended independent claims 1, 8, and 15 are submitted to be patentable under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) over <u>Egevang et al.</u> for the reasons set

forth above. Accordingly, the Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to withdraw the

35 U.S.C. § 102(b) rejections for claims 1, 3, 8, 10, 15, and 17.

Obviousness Rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103(a)

Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of the 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) rejections of

dependent claims 2, 9, and 16 as being unpatentable over Egevang et al. in view of U.S.

Patent No. 6,389,419 to Wong et al. and dependent claims 7, 14, and 21 over Egevang et al.

in view of U.S. Patent No. 6,651,096 to Gai et al. As discussed above, Egevang et al. do not

disclose each and every feature of independent claims 1, 8 , and 15. As such, Egevang et al.

do no raise a *prima facie* case of obviousness against any of dependent claims 2, 7, 9, 14, 16,

and 21. Accordingly, the obviousness rejections of claims 2, 7, 9, 14, 16, and 21 are

improper and should be withdrawn.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, the Applicant respectfully submits that all the pending

claims 1-3, 7-10, 14-17, and 21-24 are in condition for allowance. Accordingly, a Notice of

Allowance is respectfully requested. If the Examiner has any questions concerning the

present Amendment, the Examiner is requested to contact the undersigned at (408) 749-6900

ext. 6924. If any additional fees are due in connection with filing this Amendment, the

Commissioner is also authorized to charge Deposit Account No. 50-0805 (Order No.

SUNMP584). A duplicate copy of the transmittal is enclosed for this purpose.

Respectfully submitted,
MARTINE & PENILLA, L.L.P.

Michael K. Hsu, Esq.
Reg. No. 46,782

Martine & Penilla, LLP
710 Lakeway Drive, Suite 170
Sunnyvale, California 94085
Telephone: (408) 749-6900
Customer Number 32,291